

**REMARKS**

Claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 27, 31 and 36 are amended. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments merely clarify previously-claimed subject matter relating to the base station controller. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 27, 28, 31-33 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0077315 to Crook in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0092453 to Mills. The Office Action also rejects claims 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Crook in view of Mills and U.S. Patent 5,371,781 to Ardon. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 27 recites directing a call through a base station controller to a first wireless mobile terminal, ringing the first wireless mobile terminal, and receiving a request at the base station controller from a second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal in response to the ringing. Independent claim 27 also recites transferring the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request, wherein

Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2008

the transferring includes the base station controller assigning a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request, and transmitting information from the base station controller to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. More specifically, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest the specifically claimed features related to a base station controller. The Office Action cites Crook's base station controllers (BSCs) 104 (FIG. 1) when discussing the claimed base station controller. See also Crook's paragraph [0022] describing that the BSCs 104 are dispersed geographically across areas served by mobile switching centers MSCs 102 and that each BSC 104 controls one or more base transceiver stations BTSs located remote from, and connected by further communication links, to the BSC 104.

The Office Action admits that Crook does not teach features relating to receiving a request at the base station controller to pick up the call and wherein the base station controller assigns a wireless traffic channel. The Office Action then cites Mills' cordless base station 202 as shown in FIG. 3 and described in paragraphs [0043]-[0044]. However, Mills' cordless base station 202 is not a base station controller. Further, Crook's BSC 104 (which operates in conjunction with base transceiver stations (BTSs) 106 and mobile switching centre (MSC) 102) may not be modified by Mills' cordless base station 202 as alleged in the Office Action. For example, if Mills' cordless base station 202 was substituted for Crook's BSC 104, then Crook's

Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2008

communication network could not work. This would destroy the express purpose of Crook. Mills' cordless base station 202 operates in conjunction with remote wireless device 242 to provide a wireless intercom. This clearly differs from Crook's BSC 104 within a communication network that includes BTSs 106 and MSC 102. Applicant respectfully submits that the modification of Crook by Mills' cordless base station 202 as alleged in the Office Action is improper. The modification of Crook as alleged in the Office Action is for a different type of apparatus. Mills' cordless base station 202 is not a base station controller as would be known to one skilled in the art from reading the claims and specification (and Crook). Mills' cordless base station 202 is not similar to Crook's BSC 104.

Independent claim 27 recites specific features relating to a base station controller. Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest the claimed features of a same base station controller as recited in independent claim 27. That is, Crook and Mills do not teach directing a call through a base station controller to a first wireless mobile terminal in combination with receiving a request at the base station controller from a second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal in response to the ringing. Crook and Mills also do not teach or suggest that transferring the call to the second wireless mobile terminal includes the base station controller assigning a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request. Crook and Mills also do not teach or suggest transmitting information from the base station controller to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2008

For at least the reasons set forth above, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 27. Ardon does not teach or suggest the missing features. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 32 recites a first wireless mobile terminal to ring in response to a call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal from a base station controller, and a second wireless mobile terminal to generate a request to pick up the call in response to the ringing. Independent claim 32 also recites that the base station controller that receives the request from the second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal, the base station controller assigns a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request and the base station controller transfers the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request. Independent claim 32 further recites that the base station controller transmits information to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 32 relating to a base station controller. That is, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest a base station controller that receives the request from the second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal, the base station controller assigns a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal and the base station controller transfers the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in combination

Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2008

with the base station controller transmits information to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

As stated above, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest a base station controller as recited in independent claim 32. Mills' cordless base station 202 does not correspond to a base station controller as recited in independent claim 32 (as would be known to one skilled in the art from reading the specification and claims).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Crook and Mills do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 32. Independent claim 32 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 27 and 32 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Reply to Office Action dated June 4, 2008

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: August 25, 2008**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**